DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 030 119 AL 001 983

By-Wardhaugh, Ronald

Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages: The State of the Art.

Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C. ERIC Clearinghouse for Linguistics.
Pub Date Aug 69
Note-26p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.40
Descriptors-Bibliographies, *English (Second Language), Instructional Materials, *Language Instruction, Non English Speaking, Psycholinguistics, *Reference Materials, Research Needs, Surveys, *Teacher Education, *Teaching Methods, Tenl, Transformation Generative Grammar

This document has been commissioned by the ERIC Clearinghouse for Linguistics to provide an overview of resources, methodologies and activities in the field of Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages. The author points out the contributions made by various approaches to language teaching and the new insights into language arrived at by different schools of linguistic thought. He also stresses the need for greater research on many levels. His introductory review of the field of TESOL in the last twenty years is followed by: a list of historical reference materials; major bibliographic sources of information on teaching materials, texts, and articles on English language teaching; and a selected list of elementary, secondary, and adult level texts "which have been found to be useful by teachers." The second section of the paper, "Linguistics and Language Teaching," discusses in some detail the relationships between sets of model sentences in the light of transformational generative grammar. Following sections discuss "Psychology and Language Teaching," "Language Teaching Pedagogy," "Linguistics, Psychology, and Pedagogy," "Teacher Training," and "Teaching a Second Dialect." Each section contains or is followed by references to materials of particular interest to the classroom teacher. (AMM)

EDO 30116

ERIC EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR LINGUISTICS

CENTER FOR APPLIED LINGUISTICS, 1717 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, N. W., WASHINGTON, D. C. 20036

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

TEACHING ENGLISH TO SPEAKERS OF OTHER LANGUAGES: THE STATE OF THE ART

by RONALD WARDHAUGH

AL 001 983

Foreword

This document has been commissioned by the ERIC Clearinghouse for Linguistics to provide an overview of resources, methodologies and activities in the field of TESOL. A copy of this report has been placed in the ERIC System and is available from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service. For ordering procedures consult the U.S. Office of Education monthly publication "Research in Education" or write to the Clearinghouse at 1717 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W., Washington, D.C. 20036. Points of view or opinions contained in this document do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy. Comments concerning the paper's contents should be addressed to the author at the English Language Institute, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104.

A. Hood Roberts, Director
ERIC Clearinghouse for Linguistics
August, 1969

ERIC Clearinghouse for Linguistics is a part of the Educational Resources Information Center of the U. S. Office of Education

TEACHING ENGLISH TO SPEAKERS OF OTHER LANGUAGES

The State of the Art

Ronald Wardhaugh

1. Background

In the last twenty years the teaching of English to speakers of other languages within the United States has become an increasingly important concern within the educational system. The clientele is vast. It includes foreign students on university and college campuses, foreign nationals taking specialized types of training in military or industrial establishments, large groups of immigrants in certain regions (for example, in the Miami area), and native-born non-English speaking United States citizens (for example, citizens of Spanish [either Mexican or Puerto Rican] and American Indian ancestry). Nearly all ages, language backgrounds, cultures and standards of educational attainment are represented in this clientele. In recent years, too, there has been an attempt to add to it those speakers of non-standard English who, it is claimed, should learn standard English as if it were an entirely new language.

All of this activity is in addition to the effort expended in teaching English in non-English speaking countries. In this latter kind of activity all types of organizations find involvement. Some of them, such as UNESCO, are international in scope, while others are national government agencies, as for example the United States Information Agency, the Agency for International Development, the Department of State, the Peace Corps, and so on of the United States, and the British Council of the United Kingdom. Private foundations have also provided support to overseas programs either in the form of "seed" money or for short-term projects.

And, of course, within such countries the English teaching department of schools, colleges, and universities, and interested groups within industry and the professions have played a considerable part in the development of training programs in English.

Some account of the history of recent experience in teaching English as a second language may be gained from the following sources:

1. Alden, Jane. "English Language Teaching Abroad." International Educational and Cultural Exchange, 33-40 (Spring, 1966).
2. Allen, Harold B. TENES: A Survey of the Teaching of English to Non-English Speakers in the United States. Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1966.
3. Brownell, John A. Japan's Second Language. Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1967.
4. Marckwardt, Albert H. "Teaching English as a Foreign Language: A Survey of the Past Decade." The Linguistic Reporter, Supplement No. 19 (October, 1967).
5. Moulton, William G. "Linguistics and Language Teaching in the United States, 1940-1960," in C. Mohrmann, A. Sommerfelt, and J. Whatmough, eds., Trends in European and American Linguistics, 1930-1960. Utrecht: Spectrum, 1961.
6. Ohannessian, Sirarpi. "Harpers Ferry Conference on English Teaching as a World-Wide Problem." The Linguistic Reporter, 11:2.1-5 (April, 1969).

The major sources of information on materials, texts, and articles on English language teaching are as follows:

1. Aarons, Alfred C. "TESOL Bibliography." Florida FL Reporter, 5:14-15, 18-20 (Spring, 1967).

2. Allen, Harold B., ed. Linguistics and English Linguistics. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1966.

3. Center for Applied Linguistics. Aural Aids in English for Foreigners. 1964.

4. ----------. English as a Second Language in Elementary Schools: Background and Text Materials. 1967.

5. ----------. Visual Aids for English as a Second Language. 1965.

6. Centre for Information on Language Teaching and the English-Teaching Information Centre of the British Council. A Language-Teaching Bibliography. London: Cambridge University Press, 1968.

7. Hammer, John H. and Frank A. Rice, eds., A Bibliography of Contrastive Linguistics. Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1965.

8. Kaplan, Robert B., ed. Bibliography of Materials for Teachers of English as a Second Language. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1966.

9. Ohannessian, Sirarpi, ed. Reference List of Materials for English as a Second Language, Part 1: Texts, Readers, Dictionaries, Tests. Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1964.

10. ----------, ed. Reference List of Materials for English as a Second Language, Part 2: Background Materials and Methodology. Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1966.

11. ----------, ed. Selected List of Materials for Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages. Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1967.

12. ---------- and Dorothy A. Pedtke, eds. Selected List of Materials for Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages. Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1967.

13. ---------- and Ruth E. Wineberg, eds. Teaching English as a Second Language in Adult Education Programs: An Annotated Bibliography. Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1966.

14. Pedtke, Dorothy A., Bernarda Erwin, and Anna Maria Malkoç, eds. Reference List of Materials for English as a Second Language. Supplement, 1964-1968. Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969.

15. Rice, Frank A. and Allene Guss. Information Sources in Linguistics: A Bibliographical Handbook. Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1965.

Among those courses which have been found to be useful by teachers are the following:

A. Elementary and Secondary Level:

1. American English Series. English as a Second Language. Boston: D. C. Heath, 1965-.

2. Bumpass, Faye L. The New We Learn English. 5 vols. New York: American Book Company, 1968.

3. English Language Services. English This Way. 16 vols. New York: Collier-Macmillan, 1963-65.

4. Miami Linguistic Readers. 53 vols. Experimental Edition. Boston: D. C. Heath, 1964-66.

5. National Council of Teachers of English. English for Today. 8 vols. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962-66.

6. Teaching English to Puerto Rican Pupils. 4 vols. New York: Board of Education, New York City, 1957.

7. Wheeler, Gonzalez. Let's Speak English. 6 vols. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

B. Adult Level:

1. English Language Services. English 900. 13 vols. New York: Collier-Macmillan, 1964-65.

2. Institute of Modern Languages. Contemporary Spoken English. 5 vols. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1967-68.

3. Lado, Robert, Charles C. Fries, et al. An Intensive Course in English. 4 vols. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1958-64.

4. Taylor, Grant, ed. Saxon Series in English as a Second Language. 11 vols. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956-65.

5. U. S. Defense Language Institute. American Language Course. 12 vols. Lackland Airforce Base, Texas: Lackland Military Training Center, 1963-64.

A reading of the recent history of teaching English to speakers of other languages and of many of the recent books and articles on specific pedagogical issues will alert the reader to the fact that the present state of the art may be characterized by the word uncertainty. This uncertainty arises from the current ferment in those disciplines which underlie second language teaching: linguistics, psychology, and pedagogy. The uncertainty is also reflected in teacher training and in those materials which are being produced for classroom use. In addition, the problems associated with teaching a second dialect add an additional element of uncertainty to the total problem.

2. Linguistics and Language Teaching

Until as recently as a decade ago it appeared that a major breakthrough had occurred in teaching foreign languages. In vogue was a method variously described as the Aural-Oral, Audio-lingual, or even Linguistic Method, a method that derived much of its novelty from the discipline of linguistics. It appeared to many linguists that language was speech, that speech preceded writing in various ways, that the contrastive systems of phonology and grammar could be described with considerable accuracy, and that knowledge of a language as a system for conveying meanings was somehow more important than knowledge of the meanings themselves. Allied to certain ideas in learning theory, such as habit formation and interference, and to notions of programing or sequencing of materials, this linguistic knowledge seemed to promise a new era in language teaching. In such teaching emphasis was to be placed on teaching the spoken language, on teaching a language as a system, on establishing this system as a set of habits, and on reducing the learning burden by teaching only those features of the language that contrasted with those of the first language.

In 1957, however, the publication of Syntactic Structures by Noam Chomsky (The Hague: Mouton) revolutionized linguistics. In this book Chomsky called into question the basic tenets of the

discipline of linguistics, outlined a set of new assumptions, and formulated an entirely new set of questions for the discipline to address itself to. It is impossible to understand current issues in teaching English to speakers of other languages without having some understanding of the generative-transformational theory associated with Chomsky.

Generative-transformational theory stresses the creative, rule-governed nature of the linguistic knowledge of a native speaker and attempts to set up criteria by which various models of this knowledge may be evaluated. These models have been called competence models in that they are concerned with ideal linguistic behavior in an ideal setting. They are not concerned with performance, that is with actual linguistic behavior, nor are they concerned with psychological processes. Linguistic competence is said to underlie linguistic performance and to explain part of that performance: grammars themselves are not to be taken as performance models. These notions of competence and performance are discussed by Chomsky in Language and Mind (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1968).

The models express a different relationship of sounds to meanings from the models used by structural linguists. No longer are phonological, grammatical and semantic systems discussed as though they were independent of each other. Instead, either syntax or semantics is made central and the other two components (semantics and phonology, or syntax and phonology) are made subordinate. Linguists use these models in an attempt to explain how a speaker concurrently decides the content of what he wants to say and then produces that content in some kind of substance. The structural description of the content is sometimes called the deep structure and that of the substance the surface structure; however, there are no precise definitions of what either of these terms means, how the levels which they denote may be distinguished (if indeed they exist), and how deep structures become surface structures through transformational processes.

It is possible to illustrate some of the difficulties that arise in teaching English to speakers of other languages by reference to certain

specific problems in syntax, phonology, and meaning. The problems that follow are discussed in a linguistic framework only: it should be noted that the various linguistic insights that emerge do not determine any particular teaching method or methods. Too often in the past the assumption has been made that a linguistic technique could be made into a pedagogical technique (for example, the "minimal pair" technique) or that apparent insights into linguistic structure achieved by linguists should be communicated rather directly to learners. In the discussion that follows, linguistic insights are separated from pedagogical concerns of one kind or another.

Generative-transformationalists have stressed the importance of relationships between sets of sentences such as those represented in the pairs 1-2, 3-4, 5-6, 7-8, and 9-10:

1. The boy chased the dog.
2. The dog was chased by the boy.

3. The boy came. The boy is little.
4. The little boy came.

5. I asked Tom something. Tom wanted something.
6. I asked Tom what he wanted.

7. Someone opened the door.
8. The door opened.

9. You will eat your dinner.
10. Eat your dinner!

There is some good theoretical reason in each case to claim a "primacy" for the odd-numbered member(s) of each pair over the even-numbered member, because the former may be said to underlie the latter in some way, though the ways are somewhat different in each case. In the same way, 11 may be

said to be more basic than 12, even though 12 is more likely to be heard than 11:

11. Where are you going? I am going to the library.

12. Where are you going? To the library.

Generative-transformationalists have also stressed the importance of ambiguous sentences such as 13 and 14:

13. They have discarded clothes.

14. Girl Hunter Says Father Sets Example.

They insist that an adequate grammar must have devices for resolving the ambiguity of such sentences, so that 13 can be interpreted as a statement about either social workers or nudists and 14 as a newspaper headline about either the daughter of a hunter or the playboy son of a playboy father. They also point out that sentences 15-17 are identical in certain aspects of surface arrangement but basically are rather different, as shown by both the possible and impossible paraphrases which are indicated in 18-20:

15. The boy is easy to please.

16. The boy is eager to please.

17. The boy is certain to please.

18. It is easy/*eager/*certain to please the boy.

19. The boy is eager/*easy/*certain. He intends to please someone.

20. It is certain/*easy/*eager/the boy will please.

In phonology, linguists have concerned themselves with such problems as the nature of the relationship of the stop consonants within 21 and of the vowels within 22:

21. pin bin spin

22. bit beet beer

Concern with such phenomena is not new in linguistics but the proposed solutions to phonological problems in terms of ordered rules and distinctive features are new. Likewise, there is a concern for the phonological rules which are required to establish relationships not between vowel pairs such as those in 23 but between vowel pairs such as those in 24:

23. beet and bit; bait and bet; boot and good
24. meter and metric; sane and sanity; phone and phonic
    type and typical

There are certainly phonetic relationships between the pairs in 23, but there are said to be more important phonological relationships between the related words in the pairs in 24.

In semantics, the concern is with such matters as the acceptability or grammaticality of sentences such as 25-28:

25. The tree barked.
26. Our pet goldfish passed away yesterday.
27. John is as sad as the movie I saw.
28. Be intelligent!

These sentences have a variety of semantic and syntactic problems associated with them, some of which only now are linguists and philosophers beginning to tackle.

It is apparent, then, that today there are available insights into the English language that were not available only a few years ago. These insights are generated by the theory of generative-transformational grammar itself. In a sense they are the artifacts of that theory and are correct only in the sense that they conform to the requirements of the theory. But, it may well be that theories themselves are neither correct nor incorrect: theories are more interesting or less interesting, rather than correct or incorrect. They are more or less interesting because of the questions they raise and the answers they suggest for these questions. Unless they continue to raise questions and provide insights, they be-

come shop-worn and valueless. Today we see the linguistic theories of the 1940's in such a light. We tend to forget that they too were new and bright and that also "Bliss was it in that dawn to be alive!"

What is available to language teachers today from linguistics then are new insights into language, but insights which are theoretical artifacts at the same time. They cannot, however, be ignored, but must somehow be incorporated into teaching. The sets of sentences 1-10 probably suggest a new principle of gradation, that is of ordering structures from simple to complex. However, sentences 11 and 12 suggest that the criterion of frequency of usage demands that 12 be taught rather than 11, except, of course, one must assume that if the theory is in some sense "correct", an understanding of 12 presupposes a knowledge of 11. However, while ambiguity is an important aspect of language and must be accounted for, it is interesting to note that most sentences are not ambiguous. Sentences 15-20 again alert us to ambiguity and the collapsing of many "deep" structures into but a few "surface" structures; however, one cannot help but wonder whether some of the solutions linguists propose are not pseudo-grammatical in nature. The phonological examples in 21-24 remind us that both competence and performance are important. Sentences 25-28 suggest that we never forget we are teaching the language to human beings who have lived and who have brains, and not to mindless machines in dark basements.

Generative-transformational grammar provides language teachers with new insights into language. For example, no one can read English Transformational Grammar by R. A. Jacobs and P. S. Rosenbaum (Waltham, Mass.: Blaisdell, 1968) without being impressed by the insights into English structure that it contains. However, neither the grammar nor existing descriptions give teachers any way of teaching these insights nor do they provide any way of assigning a truth value to the insights on an absolute scale, apparent claims to the contrary notwithstanding. The grammar does provide a new metalanguage, a new zest, and new possibilities. However, the first two are no substitute for the last and very little has been done so far to exploit the last. Some such exploitation

of possibilities is necessary. At the moment there is a great deal of speculation ranging across the whole scale of possibility, but little actual experimentation has been done. What claims for success there are for what has been done appear to be more colored by the newness and zest just mentioned, that is, by the well-known Hawthorne effect, rather than by any intrinsic value. Chomsky himself has expressed skepticism about the immediate usefulness to language pedagogy of the linguistic theory associated with him ("Linguistic Theory," North East Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. 1966 Reports of the Working Committees, pp. 43-49).

Rigorous experimentation is required in deriving principles of gradation in both syntax and phonology; serious study is demanded of the possibilities of using generative-transformational theory in contrastive analysis; urgent clarification is required of the still muddy concepts of competence and performance; and careful documentation is essential in the area of putative linguistic universals. The time has come for the serious work of consolidation if generative-transformational theory is to have some widespread and lasting influence in teaching English as a second language.

3. Psychology and Language Teaching

Just as there has been a revolution in linguistics in the last decade, so there has also been comparable turmoil in psychology in general and learning psychology in particular. At the time the Audiolingual Method was in its heyday, it drew upon insights both from linguistics and from learning psychology, particularly from behavioristic psychology in one form or another. Specific responses were taught in relation to specific stimuli, students were taught to make appropriate responses to a variety of stimuli, habits were established, principles were acquired inductively, and reinforcement was offered in various forms, both intrinsic and extrinsic, natural and artificial. There was no particular reason for trying to use linguistic insights within one learning theory rather than another. Practitioners usually try to use current insights from relevant disciplines and this is what happened in language teaching. In retrospect, it is easy to see that it would have been equally possible to have used insights from structural linguistics with other varieties of learning theory. It is merely an historical accident or coincidence that they came to be associated with various versions of behavioristic theory. The clearest account of such linking of behavioristic learning theories to second language teaching is contained in The Psychologist and the Foreign Language Teacher by Wilga M. Rivers (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964).

Today, we can lay claim to having additional versions of learning theory available to us and to be aware of the multitude of factors that must be taken into account. However, it would be well to note J. B. Carroll's comment that "available psychological theories are a long way from dealing with the complexities of language behavior, particularly its grammatical features" ("Psychology," North East Conference Papers, 1966). However, we must still work within a theory and in a very real sense

the theory defines the data, just as the kind of spectacles we wear determines both what we see and how we see it. Today, psychologists are concerned with innateness, with learning preferences and styles, with cognition and cognitives structures of one kind or another, and with the sociological as well as the psychological factors in learning. It is obvious, therefore, that any approaches to teaching English as a second language which are likely to convince teachers of their validity must take cognizance of such emphases and that simplistic theories of conditioning, or even sophisticated theories of conditioning, will appear to be quite unconvincing. And if teachers are not convinced that what they are doing is somehow right, what they are doing is not likely to work if only for that reason.

There is now considerable evidence that different people learn in different ways and there is every reason to believe that such learning preferences are as important in second language learning as they are anywhere else. Students learn through the eye as well as through the ear, by deduction as well as by induction, and by learning about as well as by learning how. There is very little reason to believe that there is anything sacrosanct about the order: listen, speak, read and write in second language acquisition, or about inductive learning being more efficient than deductive learning. Particularly this is the case when we are dealing with older children and adults who have learned to learn in certain ways. Although these ways may not always be very efficient, they certainly cannot be ignored or dismissed out of hand. There is evidence to suggest that there are many ways to learn that dog refers to a certain kind of animal or that jump refers to a certain kind of action: one can touch dogs, see pictures of dogs, translate Hund or chien from another language; one can jump and say "jump" together, look at real people jumping, look at pictures of people jumping, and so on. There is little evidence to suggest that dog and jump must be learned in one way rather than in any other. It may of course be desirable to teach as much of the language as possible in context. For other reasons, however, it is doubtful that most learning situations can provide any more than a very limited and a very skewed set of contexts.

Learning theorists are also concerned with cognitive development in one form or another. They would like to know how cognitive abilities develop and they are interested in how learners "use their brains" in learning. In second language learning there is a consequent emphasis on developing the same ability to talk about the world in the second language as exists in the first language. Just as ability in the first language is structured in various ways, so the task in second language teaching seems to be to introduce a corresponding structure for the second language: to teach time relationships, aspects, honorifics, pronominal systems, and so on. Learning theorists also want students to give conscious attention to tasks where such attention seems appropriate so that the teaching and learning can be made more effective: tense systems can be explained and related to various time dimensions, aspectual distinctions can be discussed and paraphrases offered in the native language, and the subtleties of honorifics and pronominal systems can be described. For each of these there can be both discussion and practice. This whole approach is not unattractive to language teachers and a type of language learning theory which has been called "cognitive-code learning" theory has come into vogue in some circles. Psychologically, it appears to have much to justify it, but until more is known about the specific details of the English code (that is, how English works, for example, in its tense, aspectual and pronominal systems), what success such a theory has may derive as much from the enthusiasm it arouses in its devotees as from any psychological or linguistic validity.

Psychologists are also aware that both language and learning are in some sense social phenomena. Language both holds together and divides mankind. Styles and characteristics of learning, too, vary widely among cultures. In certain parts of the world, second, third, and even fifth or sixth languages "come easily" to everyone; in other societies a second language is "difficult" for anyone to acquire. Then again certain things must be learned at certain times and in certain ways in different cultures, whether these are courtship patterns, industrial skills or additional languages. In North America the first are

learned from peers, the second in the world of work, and the third in schools. The pattern may be quite different in other societies where either different divisions of labor exist or where entirely different groups may assume the role of teacher. One of the most interesting recent discussions of some of these problems is contained in Styles of Learning Among American Indians: An Outline for Research (Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969). In dealing with very differently oriented groups, we should be very careful that we are aware of the psychological difficulties our students may encounter in learning English because of the particular setting in which we do the teaching, or of our age, or sex, or social status. Any one of these factors, and a number besides, can negate teaching which would otherwise be successful.

Two other important concerns of psychologists should find a place in the thinking of anyone involved in second language teaching. These are the concerns with any differences that might exist between first and second language acquisition on the one hand, and with the nature of bilingualism on the other hand. It is possible to make some observations about differences between first and second language learning, for example, the universality of the former but not of the latter, the apparent drastic decrease in second language learning ability which occurs during adolescence, the availability of cognitive strategies in second language adolescence, and so on. However, little that has been written on the topic can be characterized as anything more than speculative, for example David McNeill's paper "Some Thoughts on First and Second Language Acquisition" (Cambridge, Mass.: Center for Cognitive Studies, Harvard University, 1965). The evidence on types of bilingualism (coordinate in which the two languages function independently and compound, in which one language acts as a mediator for the other) is only a little more convincing.

The ferment in psychology is very much like that in linguistics as a reading of J. B. Carroll's article "The Contributions of Psychological Theory and Educational Research for the Teaching of Foreign Languages" (in Albert Valdman, ed. Trends in Language Teaching, New York:

McGraw-Hill, 1966) will indicate. The main difference is that there seem to be more uncertainties within psychology, or within the part that is of special interest to language teachers, because learning psychology has not fallen strongly under the spell of a single theory as has current linguistics. More options seem to be available in learning theory than in linguistics. However, it should in all fairness be noted that certain generative-transformationalists have expressed a serious interest in psychological matters because they claim to be interested in the human mind. They write of linguistics as a part of cognitive psychology and matters of both perception and cognition interest them deeply. Since the psychology they espouse is cognitive rather than behavioristic, it is likely that there will be some kind of union of generative-transformational grammar and cognitive psychology. The exact form of the union is still uncertain but it is likely to influence second language teaching for many years to come.

4. Language Teaching Pedagogy

Most of the concern in second language teaching has been with either the type of linguistic knowledge that must be taught or with theories of learning. Actual teaching techniques and classroom practices have been given less consideration. It would even be true to say that many such techniques and practices have been imported into teaching from the other disciplines. Linguists and psychologists have used certain techniques in their work and language teachers have tended to adopt and adapt these same techniques, for example, the use of minimal pairs, discrimination tasks, stimulus-response drills, and so on. Some of these same techniques lent themselves very well to use with audio-visual devices, of which the tape recorder and language laboratory have been the most conspicuous. Edward M. Stack's book The Language Laboratory and Modern Language Teaching, revised edition (New York: Oxford University Press, 1966) is an interesting introduction to this aspect of pedagogy. In recent years there has been some disenchantment with both the techniques and such "hardware" as the language laboratory as various inadequacies

have appeared: a useful technique in linguistic analysis is not necessarily a useful technique for teaching a grammatical point; language is anything but a simple system of stimuli and accompanying responses; and the language laboratory is a poor substitute for a live teacher, although it is better than no teacher at all and possibly even better than a bad teacher.

In recent years there has been some concern in pedagogy for either programing materials in some way or in spiraling materials. Programing requires a very detailed analysis of what has to be taught and of terminal behavior so it is difficult to see how a course in English as a second language can be programed. Spiraling allows for growth and for uncertainty, and it recognizes a gradually developing control of various kinds of structures rather than mastery of structures item by item. As yet, materials and programs in teaching English as a second language seem to favor the programing approach; perhaps more emphasis should be placed on spiraling just as more emphasis should be placed on a wider variety of instructional techniques and settings than those that presently concern the teacher, particularly in courses which claim to be intensive: such courses may tend to become very monotonous otherwise.

There are numerous teaching methods described in language teaching publications. Perhaps it is also time for the notion of method to be given close examination. Attempts such as that made by W. F. Mackey in his Language Teaching Analysis (London: Longmans, 1965) to describe the variables involved in discussing methodology are welcome, but any examination of Mackey's book will indicate how far there is still to go. There are very obvious difficulties with assessing methods, with classroom experimentation, and even with data collection on the incidence of certain problems.

Another rapidly developing area in methodology is that of testing. Recent years have seen some interesting publications on testing and the theory behind testing. The most noteworthy of these publications are the following:

1. Harris, David P. Testing English as a Second Language. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969.

2. Lado, Robert. Language Testing: The Construction and Use of Foreign Language Tests. London: Longmans, 1961.

3. Upshur, John A. and Julia Fata, eds. "Problems in Foreign Language Testing." Special Issue Number 3, Language Learning. August, 1968.

4. Valette, Rebecca M. Modern Language Testing, A Handbook. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1967.

5. Linguistics, Psychology, and Pedagogy

It should be apparent from the preceding discussion that there is much uncertainty about how a second language should be taught. The results of classroom experiments also tend to be inconclusive (for example, George A. Scherer and Michael Wertheimer, A Psycholinguistic Experiment in Foreign-Language Teaching. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964) or of limited application (as in the unpublished Harvard doctoral dissertations by K. R. McKinnon, An Experimental Study of the Learning of Syntax in Second Language Teaching, 1965, and Kiat-Boey Lim, Prompting Vs Confirmation, Pictures Vs. Translations, and Other Variables in Children's Learning of Grammar in a Second Language, 1968). There are various claims and counterclaims but little certainty. Some theorists would insist on placing more emphasis on linguistic explanation, others on making more use of deductive teaching, and still others on giving greater recognition to the contexts of linguistic communication. However, more emphasis on explanation and deduction can lead right back to situations in which students get to know a great deal about another language but cannot use it, and more emphasis on context and communication can throw out the possibilities of any kind of systematic instruction. The safest course is perhaps that of eclecticism in which the individual teacher attempts to use what is best wherever he finds it and

refuses to subscribe to any one narrow dogma. Perhaps a new method will develop which will achieve the same kind of general approval as the Audiolingual Method, but at the moment there is no concensus as to what it would be like, nor do any recent writings indicate that someone is shortly going to articulate a new set of principles to guide language teachers. The nearest approach to a completely new textbook for language teaching is contained in William E. Rutherford's Modern English: A Textbook for Foreign Students (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1968).

6. Teacher Training

It is now possible to take training in teaching English as a second language on dozens of college and university campuses within the United States, mainly at the M.A. level. The programs vary in both scope and quality but nearly all tend to favor a considerable emphasis on a good preparation in linguistics. Other areas emphasized include methodology, psychology, sociology, literature and audio-visual education. Some programs require that students know at least one other language besides English. Beyond the master's degree there are few well-organized programs, mainly because of a general problem associated with applied linguistics (its frequent low status in the eyes of "theoretical" linguists and its essentially interdisciplinary character). Again there seems to be a need for new patterns of teacher education, or at least for significant experimentation. This problem is, of course, not unique to training teachers of English as a second language: teacher training in general is plagued with these problems.

Those who are engaged in certain aspects of teacher training are well aware of the great interest there is in finding suitable training to teach English to non-English speakers. Peace Corps returnees and a new "society-oriented" student generation provide a flow of inquiries. Recent years have witnessed some interesting attempts to devise programs for teacher training through various Congressional appropriations (National Defense Education Act, Education Professions Development Act, and the Higher Education Act) but as yet no really new pattern has evolved for either preservice or inservice training.

Teacher training and awarenesshave also been improved by developments in information dissemination. Regional laboratories, newsletters, conferences, meetings and, above all, the ERIC system are playing their part. The ERIC Clearinghouse for Linguistics, operated by the Center for Applied Linguistics, has become an important depository and processing center of TESOL documents. ERIC's monthly publication, Research in Education, as well as the Clearinghouse for Linguistics Bulletin contain titles and/or abstracts or all current substantive literature in this field. The founding of a professional organization called Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Language (TESOL) has been a very significant move to coordinate interest and activities (James E. Alatis, Executive Secretary, The School of Languages and Linguistics, Georgetown University, Washington, D. C. 20007). Of course, the Center for Applied Linguistics also continues its many services to the profession (English for Speakers of Other Languages Program, Center for Applied Linguistics, 1717 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W., Washington, D. C. 20036).

Basic methodology texts and books of readings which have been found to be useful in work with teachers are as follows:

1. Allen, Harold B., ed. Teaching English as a Second Language: A Book of Readings. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.
2. Bumpass, Faye L. Teaching Young Students English as a Foreign Language. New York: American Book Company, 1963.
3. Dacany, Fe D. Techniques and Procedures in Second Language Teaching. Quezon City, Philippines: Phoenix, 1963.
4. Finocchiaro, Mary. Teaching English as a Second Language. Revised edition. New York: Harper & Row, 1969.
5. Fries, Charles C. Teaching and Learning English as a Foreign Language. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1945.

6. Halliday, M. A. K., Angus McIntosh, and Peter Strevens. The Linguistic Sciences and Language Teaching. London: Longmans, 1964.

7. Lado, Robert. Language Teaching: A Scientific Approach. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.

8. Moulton, William G. A Linguistic Guide to Language Learning. New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1966.

9. Rivers, Wilga M. Teaching Foreign-Language Skills. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.

10. Valdman, Albert, ed. Trends in Language Teaching. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

7. Teaching a Second Dialect

One of the most controversial problems in teaching English as a second language is whether or not standard English (however it may be defined) should be taught to speakers of nonstandard dialects of English (however they, in turn, may be defined) in quasi-second language situations. It is possible to consider almost every factor in second dialect teaching within the framework that exists for second language teaching: linguistic models, contrastive analysis, learning theory, contextual support, and so on. The similarities can be stressed and some considerable justification can be given for adopting a quasi-second language teaching strategy. However, acquiring a second language and acquiring a second dialect are also subtly different from each other and it is just such subtle differences which should induce caution.

Relating a nonstandard dialect to a standard dialect or differentiating nonstandard features from standard features within a linguistic model is at least as difficult as relating or differentiating two languages. There is no reason to suppose that it is any easier and the very subtleties involved suggest that it may well be more difficult. Consequently,

there is a problem with any kind of contrastive analysis which is attempted. A nonstandard speaker already knows the language, unlike a foreigner, so he has not the same needs to be satisfied nor can he be expected to react in the same way to exercises imported directly from second language teaching. The context of learning is also much more difficult to assess, because the learner is likely to be either of a different color, social class, age group, and so on, from those with whom he identifies the standard forms. His needs and motivations will be quite different from the foreign student, the foreign national, the immigrant, or the native-born non-English speaker, all of whom can clearly distinguish the different languages and understand what their task is. The task the nonstandard speaker faces in learning standard English is not an easy one either for him or for the teacher to understand. The relationship of second dialect teaching to second language teaching deserves very serious investigation.

Some basic references are as follows:

1. Baratz, Joan C., and Roger W. Shuy, eds. Teaching Black Children to Read. Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969.

2. Labov, William. The Study of Non-Standard English. Washington, D. C.: ERIC Clearinghouse for Linguistics, Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969.

3. Shuy, Roger W., ed. Social Dialects and Language Learning. Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1965.

B. Conclusion

It should be apparent from this brief survey of the state of the art of teaching English to speakers of other languages that much serious research remains to be done. Research is needed to come to an understanding of the facts of instruction in English as a second

language throughout the world so that the total world-wide dimensions of the problems can be appreciated and the various efforts of individuals and organizations appraised. Secondly, more research is needed in the basic disciplines which underlie English language teaching, particularly with a view to bringing together theoretical insights from these disciplines into a worthwhile interdisciplinary endeavor. Thirdly, new patterns of teacher preparation need to be devised to produce large groups of skilled classroom teachers. However, the provision of sound training for the teachers of these teachers is a still more immediate goal. And finally, research is needed into the relationship, if any, between teaching English as a second language and teaching standard English to speakers of nonstandard dialects of English. Needless to say, this last research area has a particular urgency today within the United States.